

## REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **2 October 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-5, 7-16, 18-27 and 29-33. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 12-16, 18, 19, 21, 23-27, 29, 30, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Nakagawa (USPN 6,530,025, hereinafter “Nakagawa”). Claims 9, 11, 20, 22, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Nakagawa.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 12-16, 18, 19, 21, 23-27, 29, 30, and 32 were rejected as anticipated by Nakagawa. Applicant respectfully disagrees, and points out that Nakagawa discloses accessing a requested resource based on checking a user’s authentication and access rights to the resource. Based on this user and access filtering in the Nakagawa system, the requested resource is transmitted as mobile code, and access **to this transmitted resource** is also controlled by a program transmitted along with the resource (see Nakagawa, abstract, col. 4, lines 50-67, col. 5, lines 1-8). The Applicant particularly points out that Nakagawa discloses reproduction of the in-house resource on the client machine (see Nakagawa, col. 5, lines 7-8, “Consequently, the in-house ... machine”).

In contrast, embodiments of the present invention provide a system for secure and **ad hoc interaction between components** without the components having prior knowledge of each other (see lines 20-24, paragraph [0011] of the instant application). Applicant particularly points that the interaction in the present invention goes beyond **accessing in-house resources** by obtaining them via transmitted mobile code to **controlling the behavior of in-house components** using transmitted **controller objects** (see paragraph [0039] of the instant application, wherein the user of the PDA controls the display on the projector, using input devices on the PDA). The system of the present invention enables arbitrary components to securely communicate with each other by dynamically

providing each other with controller objects. Furthermore, each component stores a set of basic semantic programming, which enables each component to understand a basic set of semantic interfaces and to communicate with each other without prior knowledge of each other or of any network policy (see FIG. 5 and paragraphs [0016], [0019], and [0021] of the instant application).

There is nothing within Nakagawa, either explicit or implicit, which enables secure ad hoc interaction between two components without prior knowledge of each other. It is not possible to use the system of Nakagawa, to, for example, enable an external component to control the behavior of an in-house component, such as with the present invention in which a personal digital assistant (PDA) controls the display on a projector (see paragraphs [0037]-[0040] of the instant application). This is because the system of Nakagawa only allows for **explicit transmission of the requested resource** (see abstract, col. 4, lines 50-59) by embedding the requested resource in mobile code, and including programs to access the embedded resource within the transmitted mobile code. Furthermore, **there is no storage of semantic programming constructs within the system of Nakagawa** to enable components to communicate with one another in a manner that permits ad hoc interaction amongst them.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, and 23 to clarify that the present invention teaches storing a set of semantic programming that enables a second component to understand the semantics of a set of universal interfaces associated with the controller module, wherein this set of semantic programming enables secure ad hoc interaction between components. These amendments find support Fig. 5, paragraphs [0016], [0019], [0021], [0024], and [0037]-[0040] of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, and 23 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-5 and 7-11, which depend upon claim 1, claims 13-16 and 18-22, which depend upon claim 12, and claims 24-27 and 29-33, which

depend upon claim 23, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/  
Shun Yao  
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 2 January 2008

Shun Yao  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95618-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1667  
Fax: (530) 759-1665  
Email: shun@parklegal.com